

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current
scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

SUGAR REPORTS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE
SUGAR DIVISION

WASHINGTON, D.C.

FEBRUARY 1959

NO. 82

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGES</u>
1. MARKET REVIEW	2 - 6
2. ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE EZRA TAFT BENSON	7 - 16
3. FACING THE FUTURE OF SUGAR ACT ADMINISTRATION BY LAWRENCE MYERS, DIRECTOR, SUGAR DIVISION	16 - 24
4. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS	25
5. STATISTICAL SERIES	26 - 41
(a) Revised format for tabulations	26
(b) Highlights	26
(c) Supply and disposition by primary distributors, calendar year 1958 -- receipts, meltings, pro- duction, distributions and stocks; distribution, January 1959 and 1958, and January-December 1958 and 1957; Mainland production and quota charges, and refiners and importers receipts by source of supply, 1958 and 1957.	27 - 30
(d) Status of quotas as of January 31 and February 11, 1959, and comparison of charges to quotas January 1959 and 1958.	31 - 33
(e) Deliveries by primary distributors by States: December, fourth quarter, calendar year 1958, and comparison January-December 1958 and 1957; December, fourth quarter, and calendar year 1957 revised.	34 40
(f) Sugar prices by areas.	41
(g) Refined sugar production and stocks.	41
6. CATEGORIES, NAMES, AND PRINCIPAL LOCATIONS OF PRIMARY DISTRIBUTORS	42 - 45

MARKET REVIEW

On February 16, the basis price for refined sugar in 100-pound bags to the Northeast was reduced .15 cent to 9.20 cents per pound. The 9.35 cent price had prevailed since May 19, 1958. Preceding this reduction in the price for packaged refined sugar, Northeast refiners had announced zone-delivered prices for liquid sugar and bulk dry sugar. On February 2, the delivered prices of these sugars were reduced from .15 to .20 cent depending on destination. Some refiners had reduced the price of packaged refined sugar before February 16, but on that date, the reduction became effective for all refiners in that territory. The .15 cent decrease was also applied to the Southeast making the basis price there 9.05 cents per pound. In the Gulf territory prices were lowered .10 cent and the basis price is now 9.15 cents per pound. These refined sugar price changes were preceded by lower raw sugar prices, an average duty paid price of 6.00 cents per pound prevailing during the first half of February. Thus the current relationship reflects a gross refining margin of 3.20 cents per pound, equal to the average for January, 1959, and about 0.20 cent more than for either the calendar year 1958 or the period (May-December) when refined sugar was quoted at 9.35 cents per pound.

On January 30, refined sugar prices in the Chicago-West territory declined .20 cent per pound on a day-to-day basis. At present, refined cane is selling at 8.85 cents and beet sugar at 8.65 cents per pound in that territory less a .10 cent allowance in most of Illinois, Southeastern Wisconsin, and St. Louis, Missouri. The .25 cent freight allowance to the Missouri River territory continues in effect. Eastern beet sugar prices were also reduced .20 cent to 8.65 cents per pound effective January 30.

Cane and beet refined sugars are quoted at 9.20 cents per pound for 100-pound bags in the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada. In the Pacific Northwest, the quoted price for cane and beet industrial sugar is 8.95 cents per pound. However, a .20 cent allowance is in effect for most of the Pacific Coast territory.

Total deliveries for United States consumption through February 14, 1959, were 821,000 tons or 19,000 less than during the same

period last year. However, after the record deliveries during December 1958 of 842,000 tons, 59,000 tons higher than during December 1957, an even larger decrease might have been anticipated. Despite record deliveries during December, beet sugar deliveries to date in 1959 are 14,000 tons higher than to the same date in 1958. Revision of preliminary reports now indicates that 1958 sugar deliveries for United States consumption totalled 9,034,000 short tons, raw value, 300,000 tons more than in 1957 and 130,000 tons more than the previous record in 1956. Beet sugar deliveries were 175,000 tons above the preceding year and cane sugar deliveries were 125,000 tons higher (those of refiners being up 134,000 tons, importers up 2,000 tons and mainland cane mills down 11,000).

During 1958, the limited production in Hawaii and Puerto Rico created special interest in the supply and demand situation in the Northeast, which is more directly dependent on the availability of offshore sugar than other parts of the Nation. Data are now available for a factual evaluation.

Refiners "North of Hatteras" received 3,163,000 tons of quota sugar in 1958. This quantity was about 1 percent more than for the preceding year and within 1 percent of the all-time high which occurred in 1956, the year of the Suez and Hungarian crises. In 1958 these refineries also received under bond 80,000 tons of 1959 quota sugar, enough more than in 1956 or 1957 so that total receipts reached a new high in 1958. Although these Northeast refineries represent only 51 percent of total refiners' volume, they accounted for 65 percent or 87,000 tons of the increase in deliveries from 1957 to 1958 for all refiners. Their customers in New England and Middle Atlantic states, where the greatest concern about 1958 supplies existed, took slightly less sugar from refiners and slightly more from importers in 1958 than in 1957. Total sugar deliveries in these areas in the two years differed by less than one percent. Refiners' deliveries in those Southern states supplied in substantial part by Northeast refineries increased less than 20,000 tons so that more than three-fourths of the increase in deliveries from the refineries "North of Hatteras" went into competitively "fringe" territory.

Total year-end stocks of Northeast refineries were about 40,000 tons higher than the previous year. Their quota stocks were about 20,000 tons less than a year earlier but 9,000 more than

those held December 31, 1956.

To summarize, during 1958 Northeast refineries operated at a record rate, increased deliveries into "fringe" territory, and increased their total stocks at year end.

The International Sugar Council met in London for its first session under the International Sugar Agreement of 1958. Australia, Peru, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom had deposited their instruments of ratification before January 1, 1959. The Council approved the accession of El Salvador as an exporting country that may export to the free market up to 5,000 metric tons, raw value, a year. Thirty other countries have notified their intention to ratify or to accede to the Agreement in accordance with their constitutional processes. All of the countries to which the Agreement assigns votes as exporting countries, except India, and nine importing countries, among them the United States, are included.

The Council elected Mr. D. A. Bruce Marshall (Canada) as its Chairman and Dr. Leon Ma. Guerrero (Philippines) as its Vice Chairman for 1959.

Minimum net requirements of the free market in 1959 were estimated at 5,405,000 metric tons, raw value. This figure excludes any requirements which exporting member countries may have: The Netherlands has produced more sugar than it needs for domestic food purposes; but it will require free market sugar for the manufacture of export goods. Hungary has imported 20-25 thousand tons during each of the last three years and may do so again this year.

Provisional initial quotas were set at 100 percent of the sum of basic export and special reserve tonnages in view of production uncertainties.

As of February 20, the price of raw sugar, f.a.s. Cuban port, destined to the world free market, had been below 3.25 cents per pound for seventeen market days (since January 28) and below 3.15 cents for thirteen market days (since February 3). Accordingly, International Sugar Agreement quotas in effect (including special reserve tonnages) are now automatically reduced by 2.5 percent, from 6,390,000 metric tons, raw value,

to 6,230,000 tons and the International Sugar Council will meet on February 25th to decide whether any further reduction shall be made. If the Council reaches no agreement, quotas will be reduced automatically by another 2.5 percent to 6,070,000 tons.

As of February 17th, 138 of Cuba's 161 mills were reported grinding compared with 52 as of January 31. Cuban sugar production through February 15 was reported as 627 thousand Spanish long tons. This relatively small output reflects the late and hesitating start of the present campaign; but it amounts to only slightly less than average production through February 15 during the four years 1953 through 1956, which was 648 thousand tons. During that period production was heavily restricted and ranged from 4.4 to 5.0 million tons a year. The present crop has been set at 5.8 million tons.

The text of the Cuban Government decree setting that production goal indicates that the January 1, 1959 Cuban carryover was 589 thousand tons, i.e. 70,000 tons less than indicated in Sugar Reports 81 page 4. Accordingly, the text table on that page is revised as follows:

Cuba: 1959 Sugar Supplies and Requirements 1/

	1,000 Sp.l.t. <u>raw sugar</u>	1,000 m.t. <u>raw sugar</u>	1,000 sh.t. <u>raw sugar</u>
Carryover <u>2/3/</u>	589	607	669
Production	<u>5,800</u>	<u>5,976</u>	<u>6,588</u>
Total supply	6,389	6,583	7,257
U.S. quota <u>2/</u>	2,624	2,704	2,981
U.S. Reserve	500	515	568
Free market <u>3/</u>	2,344	2,415	2,662
Local consumption	350	361	398
Reserves	571	588	648
Total requirements & <u>reserves</u>	6,389	6,583	7,257

1/ Liquid sugar and sugar for livestock feed in the U.S. excluded, Cuban quota under U.S. Sugar Act of 3,060,475 sh.r.v. converted to Sp. l.t. by factor 1.1358213. Reciprocally, same factor used for converting Cuban data from Sp. l.t. to short tons.

2/ Includes 445,166 Sp.l.t. carryover available for U.S., 104 thousand tons of which was under bond in the U.S. on December 31, 1958. 3/ Includes 143,750 Sp. l.t. carryover available to Free Market.

The Philippine Sugar Quota Administration recently raised its estimate of current crop year production from 1,380 thousand to 1,393 thousand short tons, raw sugar.

The Brazilian Sugar and Alcohol Institute raised its production estimate for the year ending May 31, 1959 by 89 thousand metric tons, tel quel, from 2,928 thousand to 3,017 thousand tons. This would be about the same amount as that actually produced during the calendar year 1958, 3,004 thousand tons, and represents increases of 13 and 34 percent over the years ended May 31, 1958 and 1957, respectively. Domestic consumption during the calendar year 1958 was 2,254 thousand tons; exports amounted to 776 thousand tons; stocks declined slightly from 1,016 to 990 thousand tons during the year. As a part of a recent general devaluation, proceeds from sugar exports are being exchanged at the rate of 100 cruzeiros per dollar. This 9 percent increase in the cruzeiro payment for sugar exports has been small compared with an almost simultaneous 30 percent increase in the domestic mill price of standard crystal sugar. Since 1956, the exchange rate of the cruzeiro for sugar exports has been increased by about 50 percent (from 67 to 100 cruzeiros per dollar), while the domestic mill price has almost doubled (from 330.30 cruzeiros per 60 kg. bag to 650 cruzeiros). However, under the Brazilian sugar program, a freight and export equalization tax is levied and compensation payments are made to assure equality of sugar prices regardless of location of mill and domestic or foreign destination of the sugar.

Pravda reported U.S.S.R. sugar production during the calendar year 1958 of 5.4 million metric tons of refined sugar, 121 percent of 1957 production. Deducting 182,000 tons of sugar refined from Cuban raw cane sugar and 1.2 million tons of sugar processed from 1957 crop beets during the first calendar year quarter of 1958, indicates beet sugar processings from April through December 1958 of 4.0 million tons; this compares with 3.6 million tons of refined beet sugar produced from April through December 1957.

Address
by
Secretary of Agriculture
Ezra Taft Benson
before
California Beet Growers Association
San Francisco, California
January 30, 1959

I am pleased to participate in this meeting sponsored by the California Beet Growers Association. I count it an added privilege to find here also so many representatives from other sugar beet areas throughout the country. It is always a joy to visit this historic and beautiful city in the Nation's leading agricultural State.

The development of the beet sugar industry is one of the most fascinating chapters in the history of American agriculture. It is a story of vision, initiative, struggle, of repeated failures and final success. It is a story of the triumph of perseverance by free men in a free economy in a free land. Perhaps it will not be amiss for us to refresh our minds on a point or two of that story.

Early in the history of this Nation, men of vision watched with keen interest the development of the beet sugar industry in Europe. The United States was then almost completely dependent on foreign countries for sugar. These men saw that if we could produce beet sugar here in the United States, great advantages would result. A new industry would bring new life to the economy. A new and profitable crop would be added to our agriculture.

Back in the 1830's the first recorded attempts were made to establish a beet sugar industry in this country. The Beet Sugar Society of Philadelphia in 1836 obtained 600 pounds of beet seed from Europe. But the seed was planted too late and no sugar resulted. Then about 1839 a factory at Northampton, Massachusetts, succeeded in producing some 1300 pounds of beet sugar. After operating for about two years, this factory closed its doors.

In the next few decades no less than 13 beet sugar factories were established in widely separated localities from Maine to California. One after the other, they all failed.

One of these attempts that is most interesting to me concerns the efforts of the Mormon pioneers to establish a beet sugar industry in Utah. In those early days, more than a century ago, the people

of Utah, including some of my progenitors, were buying sugar for \$1.00 a pound -- at a time when a dollar went a great deal further than it does today.

After a study of beet sugar operations in France, Mormon Church officials organized the Deseret Manufacturing Company, intending to establish the industry in Utah. The company bought a complete sugar manufacturing outfit and shipped it from France to New Orleans. It arrived in April 1852. They brought the plant up the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers to Fort Leavenworth. There they loaded it into covered wagons. In November 1852, after many difficulties and hardships, the equipment reached its destination.

I wish I could say that this tremendous effort immediately resulted in the birth of a new industry in Utah and in the Nation. Unfortunately, history records that the promoters lacked sufficient technical knowledge and the factory produced only inedible syrup. Not until over a quarter of a century later was the first beet sugar industry in the United States established on a truly successful basis.

That was in 1879 at Alvarado, California.

Without taking anything away from California, however, I am happy to say that the people in Utah also persisted and eventually developed a flourishing sugar beet industry.

In the past 80 years, the sugar beet industry has had a steady growth. Some 64 factories now produce over 2 million tons of refined sugar annually.

California, the home of the first successful sugar beet factory, is now also the Nation's largest producer of sugar beets.

Last year, despite a poor planting season and sharply reduced yields, California produced about one-fourth of all the sugar beets grown in the United States.

The sugar beet industry is in a solid position. Production last year was about 15.3 million tons. This was about 30 percent above the 10-year average and only slightly below the all-time high of 1957. Yields per acre in the past two years have been higher than ever before. But you are not burdened with surpluses as producers of some other crops are. The industry has been doing a good job of expanding production and markets simultaneously.

Your operations have been realistic -- geared to market conditions.

The Sugar Act is realistic legislation. It has brought benefits to sugar beet and sugar cane farmers, to consumers of sugar, to the sugar industry as a whole, and to our foreign suppliers.

But the sugar program cannot be used as a model for farm crops in general, particularly those produced in quantities beyond our domestic needs. We import much of the sugar we consume. Therefore surpluses of sugar, when they develop, tend to occur abroad rather than in this country. We have helped alleviate the problem of surplus abroad. The United States Government and the domestic sugar industry have participated in the development of an International Sugar Agreement designed to stabilize the world market. I know it is due in no small part to the cooperation of many of you that no major difficulties have been encountered in adjusting our domestic production so as to prevent the piling up of surpluses here at home.

By keeping prices at reasonable levels the danger of pricing sugar out of the market has been avoided.

The program has permitted, and encouraged, more efficient production. Here in California from 1924 to 1957 yields per acre rose 127 percent. In our country's beet area the acreage per farm has doubled since the prewar period. This has permitted the use of labor-saving machines which have simplified production and harvesting problems and have reduced costs. During the past decade the man-hours required to produce a ton of beets have declined by at least one-third.

But, I repeat, the sugar program cannot be used as a model for wheat, cotton, corn, rice, peanuts, and tobacco programs -- except in this respect: The sugar program has been realistic.

The programs for the six legislatively designated basic crops have not been realistic. The sugar program has been adapted to the particular circumstances surrounding U. S. production of sugar. The same cannot be said of the past programs for the basic crops.

Unrealistic programs have priced the basics out of some of their old-time markets. Competitors at home and abroad used the artificial price umbrella to expand their production and move in.

Surpluses piled up at home, followed by more and more cutbacks in acreage.

Last year we harvested 16 percent more acres of sugar beets than the 10-year average from 1947 to 1956. But last year, compared with the average for the same 10 years, we harvested

- 10 percent fewer acres of corn,
- 16 percent fewer acres of wheat,
- 25 percent fewer acres of peanuts,
- 26 percent fewer acres of rice,
- 34 percent fewer acres of tobacco, and
- 46 percent fewer acres of cotton.

Now I know there will be some who will quickly point out that comparing an import crop with export crops is not very meaningful. I don't want to read too much into this comparison. All I want to do is to show that where we have realistic programs -- programs adapted to market conditions -- programs that make sense -- we can have an expanding agriculture. Where we have programs that are outmoded, unrealistic, not adapted to market conditions, we have a contracting agriculture.

As you know, the Administration has recommended that the Sugar Act be extended. Senator Ellender has introduced a bill to make the Sugar Act permanent. This measure is co-sponsored by many Senators from Western States, including Senators Kuchel and Engle of this State. These proposals illustrate the importance of this legislation, not only to farmers but to all our people.

It seems paradoxical, but the sugar program's popularity may constitute its greatest weakness. When the pressures to increase production are as great as they are in the case of domestic sugar beets and mainland cane, they demand attention.

The Department of Agriculture is charged with administering the Act in a manner that will protect the welfare of consumers as well as the welfare of those engaged in the domestic sugar producing industry -- and that includes the growers.

I trust that all branches of our domestic sugar industry will collaborate with the Department in dealing with the problems that appear to face us in administering the sugar program. The success of the past has been due in large part to the fact that the sugar industry has borne a major share of responsibility for the

administration of this program. Let us continue to face facts honestly and courageously. I feel confident that if we join in support of fearless and essential administrative actions, the sugar program will continue to be an effective force, bring benefits to producers, the domestic sugar industry, and consumers.

Your future progress, like that of all agriculture, depends on how successfully you lower costs, improve quality, and expand markets.

As one who grew up in sugar beet country -- who was thinning beets with a short-handled hoe at the age of 7 -- I'm delighted to see the advances that are being made.

With your great record of achievement, you can look ahead to still further progress -- to improved varieties, better control of disease, and such developments as the monogerm seed to bring greater efficiency and more profits in the future. The productive new varieties you are now growing have done well in holding down our old enemy, curly top. You've learned a lot about using fertilizer to increase yields. The sugar beet has been tailored to fit the machine, and machines have been built to take over most of the tasks in the fields.

But new problems are always arising. The new varieties don't stand up to virus yellows. And we have not yet achieved a quality in machine harvest that is as good as the best when beets are harvested by hand.

The search for the right answers is being carried forward on many fronts. Some of the solutions will come out of production research; others will grow out of research on processing problems. Still other advances will come from the basic research of our new pioneering laboratories.

With all these efforts we are building for the future -- for greater efficiency in production and marketing, which means lower costs -- for higher quality -- and for new markets at home and abroad.

This is the road to a truly prosperous, expanding, and free agriculture.

Immediately before us, however, is the task of completing a long overdue revision of the farm price support programs as applied to the basic crops.

The President yesterday sent a special agricultural message to Congress. This was his fourth agricultural message. Again he called for changes in a farm program that has become outmoded, costly, discriminatory, and harmful.

We still have only a small part of the program the Administration asked for and that farmers need. We have had to fight every inch of the way to get more flexibility into the pricing mechanism. On such commodities -- tobacco for example -- nothing has been done. On others we got a little flexibility but not enough. That is why it has been necessary to devise and maintain such emergency programs as the Soil Bank and P. L. 480.

Our program really has never been put into operation. It has never been given a real try.

That is why the surpluses have built up. That is why a few farm commodities still have serious problems.

Yet our technicians estimate that, even with the little legislation we have been able to get on price supports, we have expanded markets and cut costs to taxpayers by a billion dollars in 1958. And farmers are taxpayers, too.

My fellow citizens, the situation is critical.

The present price support, acreage control program as it applies to wheat is bankrupt. Tobacco and peanuts are also in trouble.

Wheat is our number one problem. Harvested wheat acreage has been cut by over 20 million acres since 1949 -- yet, under artificial pricing, combined with good weather, we now have by far the greatest wheat surplus in all history.

By July 1960 the carryover of wheat will be about 1-1/2 billion bushels -- enough to supply our normal domestic requirements for 2-1/2 years. We will have \$3-1/2 billion tied up in wheat alone. We cannot continue to produce wheat for government by government-provided incentives.

We have spread the Wheat Belt all over America. Wheat acreage has increased in areas of high cost, while acres have been cut back in areas where production is most efficient. This doesn't make sense.

The costs of farm price and income stabilization programs have risen dangerously high.

By next July we will have over \$9 billion of surplus farm commodities in government inventory and under loan. The cost of storage and interest on these government stocks will be \$1 billion a year. This is fantastic and indefensible.

The program is unfair and discriminatory.

Farmers produce commercially about 250 farm crops. Only a very few are price supported. And 85 percent of our Federal inventory of farm commodities consists of just three crops -- wheat, cotton, and corn.

Less than one-third of our farms account for by far the greater part of our price support outlays.

About one-fourth of the cotton farms have three-fourths of the cotton acreage allotments.

Two-fifths of the farms with wheat allotments have 90 percent of the allotted acres.

Thus, relatively small numbers of farms -- usually those with the highest income -- account for practically all of the government price support outlays.

Finally, the old program is harmful not only to producers of wheat, tobacco, and peanuts -- but harmful to agriculture as a whole.

It has caused distortions throughout our agricultural economy.

It has caused many people to regard farm programs with suspicion and resentment.

It has depressed farm income.

It has wasted farm resources.

It has placed a ceiling on farm opportunity.

It has enmeshed farmers in a maze of government controls.

The President again recommended to the Congress further forthright changes in our farm price supports. He urged that price supports no longer be related to a standard 45 years old,

but to a percentage of the average market price during the previous three years.

If the Congress still prefers to relate price supports to outmoded standards, the President urged that discretion be provided for establishing the level in accordance with guidelines fixed by law. This is now the case for all commodities except the few for which supports are mandatory.

The alternatives before us are clear. Take wheat. Either we must clamp down with more rigorous controls on wheat producers than we have ever had before -- more controls than Congress has ever been willing to impose -- or we must move toward market expansion and greater freedom to produce and compete.

The controls we have don't control. Wheat allotments have been cut. But wheat yields have nearly doubled in about 20 years. And last year's crop was the biggest ever.

Moreover, the controls provided by earlier Congresses have been watered down by later Congresses. The allotments used to be based on planted acres -- now they are based on harvested acres. The minimum national allotment for wheat is 55 million acres, required by law. But if we applied the formula in the old 1938 law, still in effect, to wheat in 1959 -- please note this -- the national allotment would be zero acres -- no wheat production at all!

A far better approach, I believe, would be to provide wheat growers with a program that moves toward freedom to produce and compete for markets.

When such a program became fully effective it would eliminate all acreage allotment and marketing quotas for wheat.

It would relate price supports for wheat to realistic market conditions.

Preferred quality wheat would then sell in the markets at premiums above support.

With such a program, wheat could really compete on its own merits. Better land use would result. High hazard land would go into pasture and hay.

Other conservation measures would be adopted by farmers.

Farmers could more effectively manage their farms and their crop rotations.

There would be an adjustment of acreage between such competing crops as corn, grain sorghums, and soybeans.

Changes are needed for tobacco and peanuts also. The present laws require price supports at continually rising levels. As prices of U. S. tobacco increase, foreign buyers change their blends and turn to other sources of supply. Legislation is needed to permit adjustments in support levels.

For peanuts, too, the law should be changed so that growers can expand their markets.

The Agricultural Act of 1958 was a step toward more realistic programs for producers of corn, cotton, and rice. Now we need prompt and effective action in behalf of producers of wheat, tobacco, and peanuts.

This is not only the wheat, tobacco, and peanut producer's battle for realistic farm programs. This is your battle -- the battle of everyone in every phase of agriculture.

Our present costly farm programs contribute to unbalancing the budget. That is of utmost concern to every citizen. No nation can go on indefinitely living beyond its income.

The President last week submitted a balanced budget for the coming fiscal year -- a budget that "will help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the hidden and unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes."

As the President said in his Economic Report: "Our objective must be to establish a firm foundation for extending economic growth with stable prices into the months and years ahead. This will not come about automatically...an indispensable condition for achieving vigorous and continuing economic growth is firm confidence that the value of the dollar will be reasonably stable in the years ahead."

This is of vital importance to all of us. During periods of economic expansion the demand for sugar increases. Your

prosperity like that of our agriculture in general depends on the soundness of the American economy.

We must keep our economy strong. Yes, we must keep America strong -- strong economically, strong socially, but above all, spiritually strong -- so that our way of life may endure. This is your challenge and mine -- a challenge to every American no matter who or what he may be. "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it." (Daniel Webster)

FACING THE FUTURE OF SUGAR ACT ADMINISTRATION

Address
by
Lawrence Myers, Director
Sugar Division
before
California Beet Growers Association
San Francisco, California
January 30, 1959

The domestic sugar growing industry has undergone vital changes in the post-war period. If our domestic sugar program is to prove as successful and satisfactory in the future as it has been in the past, then growers and processors must find ways of dealing effectively with the problems that are here now and promise to stay with us for years to come. Let me emphasize that these problems confront you growers and processors. You cannot delegate them to the government to worry about, neither can you scare these problems away by denying their existence or by hiding your heads in the sand.

It is not my purpose today to deal with the changes that have occurred in the sugar situation but rather to call attention to the administrative problems that result from these changes. However, it might be worth while to cite a few of the major changes. Most of these changes have made farmers want to increase their production of sugar beets and sugarcane.

First let us note the change in comparative prices. In 1951 at the height of the Korean War the price of sugar beets was 89 percent of parity compared with 94 percent for all farm crops and 107 percent for all farm products, including livestock. In 1954, the year before acreage controls were undertaken, sugar

beet prices were 88 percent of parity compared with 86 percent for all farm crops and 89 percent for all farm products. In November 1958, the latest month for which data are available, the estimated return for sugar beets amounted to 90 percent of parity compared with 81 percent for all farm products, including livestock, and 73 percent for all crops. The comparative price situation has resulted in tremendous pressure to increase the production of sugar beets since acreage controls were inaugurated in 1955.

The restrictions on production of other farm crops, such as wheat, corn and cotton, are causing millions of acres of land to be seeking productive use. These job-hunting acres result in a steady bombardment of acreage requests upon Congressmen, Senators and departmental people in Washington, as well as the people in our State and County Offices throughout the beet area. The people presenting these requests are not interested in the fact that the beet sugar industry is small; that it would be swamped if even one million acres were planted to sugar beets, or that the beet industry can offer no solution to the problem of the millions of unused acres resulting from the control programs for our major crops. These people also are not impressed with arguments that the beet sugar enterprise should be reserved for growers who stayed by it in the lean years when others were turning to the production of more profitable crops. Each petitioner is interested only in getting the acreage he himself desires.

Throughout the west vast irrigation projects are bringing under cultivation hundreds of thousands of acres of new land suitable for the production of sugar beets. Some of these lands are in government reclamation projects but vast areas are also being brought under irrigation, especially through the sinking of wells, with the use of private funds.

Production methods are being revolutionized. The average yield of sugar beets per acre for the United States has been increasing so rapidly that serious question arises as to whether future increases in consumption will come fast enough to equal the upward trend in yields per acre. Machine methods have cut costs on large scale operations and they have simplified the labor problem.

The effect of these post-war changes can be summarized in terms of production. In 1952 our production of beet sugar was just over 1,500,000 tons. In 1954 it was close to 2 million tons. The 1958

crop, even with controls, is expected to exceed 2,200,000 tons. In considering 1958 production let us remember that we satisfied less than 10 percent of the requests formally applied for by new growers and in some producing districts we satisfied less than 2 percent of the requests so filed. In some localities, at least, it is probable that requests would have doubled if farmers who wanted to grow beets had thought there was any real likelihood that they could obtain proportionate shares.

I know of no reason to assume that there will be any decline in the demand for sugar beet acreage. The demand may even become more persistent. Likewise I know of no reason to assume that we can find a satisfactory market for the sugar, if the production of beet sugar were to increase by 700,000 tons in the next six years as it has in the past six years.

Although the general pressures are for increased production, there are localities in which production is falling off. Expanding urban developments, the passing of the small, inefficient, subsistence farms, and other factors are giving rise to production problems in some parts of the country.

Now let us turn to the subject of acreage controls. At the outset I want to congratulate the California Beet Growers Association on its poll to determine the sentiment of its grower members with respect to restrictive proportionate shares, or acreage controls. It is always helpful for administrative agencies to know the sentiment of the people affected.

The subject of acreage controls has been discussed so long by so many that it may be worth while reviewing a few fundamentals. First, the legal authority for the acreage control program is not at issue. Every program of this sort is studied with the greatest of detail and reviewed by a whole staff of lawyers before it is finally approved. Neither is there an issue as to the need for controls. I do not see how anyone who will study the facts can deny that farmers could and would, if permitted to do so, raise more sugar beets than our factories could process. Clearly, our beet processing plants could produce sugar far in excess of their marketing outlets.

The question that we in the Department raised in 1954 was whether it was necessary for the government to control sugar beet acreage of the individual farmers or whether processors, operating under their marketing allotments, would automatically keep the total

acreage within reasonable bounds. When we asked that this matter be examined we also suggested that study be given to providing sufficient participation by grower associations and supervision or review by governmental agencies to insure fair treatment to individual farmers.

These questions were put to the industry first in 1953 and 1954 when there was a close balance between the relative attractiveness of sugar beets and other crops. Today the price pressures and acreage pressures are much stronger than they were in 1953 and 1954. With the resulting production pressures as great as they are today, it probably would be futile to attempt to turn controls over to the industry. Since we now have governmental acreage controls for the sugar beet industry and are likely to have them for a long time to come, we must learn to live with them.

Unfortunately our experience to date in sugar gives us no adequate guides for the future. In the pre-war period restrictive proportionate share programs were undertaken on sugar beets only in 1939 and 1941. The 1941 program was relaxed to permit the marketing of beets from excess acreage. From 1941 to 1955 no acreage restrictions were in effect on sugar beets and during the past four years the problems have been lessened by material increases in beet sugar marketing quotas. Obviously such experience does not tell us how, over an extended period of time, to reconcile tight controls with increasing pressures to produce.

Although the experience to date has not provided us with a polar star by which to guide the industry, it has brought to light some of our problems.

Early in the post-war control program it became evident that we could not deal satisfactorily with the new producer problem simply by prorating the acreage set aside for new producers over the total request from new producers. To do so would result in such small acreages per farm that the proportionate shares for new producers could not have been utilized. To illustrate, if this system had been undertaken last year in the Red River Valley, the proportionate share for each new producer would have been a fraction of an acre. To avoid such absurdities, the States were authorized to establish proportionate shares for new producers in terms of economic units. The economic unit is an acreage large enough to be operated with a reasonable

degree of efficiency under the conditions existing in the area in which it is established.

When only a minor percentage of the new producer applications can be granted, charges of favoritism are certain to arise. To get the acreage into the best possible locations in each area, criteria have been established for reviewing the applicants and in some cases a final determination has been made by drawing numbers out of a hat. Methodology may be fair but it can offer no adequate consolation for the grower whose application has been turned down.

Since the Secretary of Agriculture is specifically required by the Act to protect the interests of small producers as well as new producers, provision has been made for granting, to the extent possible, the applications for acreage increases of small producers to the extent necessary to bring them up to the economic unit established for new producers.

Closely allied to the problem of the minimum acreage per farm has been the minimum acreage per plant. Although we have studied this matter carefully and sympathetically, we have not been able to justify such specialized treatment under the terms of the Act. Substantially such a proposal suggests that growers with a particular production history and demonstrated ability to produce be given additional acreage if they happen to operate in an area where the processing plant has had difficulty in obtaining adequate acreage. The giving side of this proposal would be rather pleasant, but the other side of the coin is unpleasant. The acreage added to the benefitted area would have to be taken from other areas. If the industry should wish us to give such specialized treatment, we hope they will amend the Act to provide for it.

Next comes the minimum acreage per State. Several states with small beet acreages wish to expand. In some cases the area that desires to expand is highly concentrated, in others it is spread over a large area. Admittedly, it would be desirable from the standpoint of over-all efficiency, especially the efficient use of processor fieldmen, to have favorable concentrations of acreage. Certainly the desire of States to expand their sugar beet enterprises can be understood. Again, however, we are confronted with the fact that the granting of additional acreages to such States would necessitate the granting of smaller acreages to other States. Again we should like specific legal authorization if we are to take such action!

At this point I should like to ask processors to caution their fieldmen not to make a difficult problem intolerable by passing the buck or giving unjustified encouragement to "would be" new producers and new producing areas. Repeatedly, we have received requests from new areas stating that some processor fieldman assured the applicants he would be delighted to contract for their acreage if they could just succeed in getting a proportionate share. In other cases it appeared that the processor fieldman threatened to close down a beet dump if the local growers could not increase the area tributary to it. Certainly this industry knows that the Department of Agriculture did not ask for the job of controlling sugar beet acreage. I am sure your Executive Manager and other officials have informed you of the efforts we made to keep the government out of this control program. I trust that growers and processors alike will realize that if the program fails it will injure them more than it will the Department of Agriculture.

Among the most persistent demands for special consideration are those coming from growers on government reclamation projects. Usually these requests reflect the need of veterans who have gone heavily into debt to acquire a small acreage and find few suitable crops to produce with sugar beets the most promising crop. Unfortunately we cannot consider such requests by themselves. If the farmers in reclamation districts are permitted to expand their acreage disproportionately, then the acreage of other farmers must be reduced correspondingly. In considering this matter we must recognize also that government reclamation projects constitute only a part of the recent vast developments in irrigation. Irrigation wells established by private capital are opening up huge acreages in a number of States where sugar beets are well adapted. Surely if special treatment is to be accorded new producers on reclamation projects then it must be accorded new producers on private irrigation projects.

The next logical question is how new producers on irrigation projects can be singled out for favored treatment. Some of our most efficient beet sugar producing districts are non-irrigated. Again I shall not attempt to answer the question. We need your recommendations and guidance. However, if special treatment for some is desired, it should be written into the law.

I trust that all these references to new producer problems will not be taken as an indication that our old producer problems have been solved. The sharp reduction in the number of sugar

beet farms during the war and post-war period permitted the acreage per farm for old producers to be doubled during the years prior to the inauguration of production controls. That has simplified the old grower problem. Nevertheless, there is still a persistent demand for larger acreage for old growers. I need hardly inform this audience that old growers will guard zealously their position in the industry. In making that observation, let me also add my commendation to the California industry for supporting a liberal policy in dealing with the applications of new producers.

One of the features of our acreage control program that has been confusing to some has been the reallocation of unused acreage. To many who have been trained in the control programs of cotton, wheat and our other basic crops, the reallocation of unused sugar beet proportionate shares seems to destroy the control program.

Those who are confused as to the purpose and effect of the reallocation procedure need to study the differences between our export and import crops. Sugar is an import commodity and the Act provides not merely for the restriction of marketings and production in accordance with the formulas laid down in the Act, but it also preserves to growers the right to produce sufficient sugar to fill their marketing quotas and have a normal carryover. The reallocation procedure was adopted because growers and processors in each State demanded the assurance that could be obtained through reallocations that they could produce up to the full amount that would be accorded their States and districts under the historic pattern.

When the control program was being formulated in 1955, it was decided that, as a protection to growers, proportionate shares would not be reallocated in cases in which the processor refused to contract with the grower or in which the failure to contract resulted from processor-grower disputes. That seemed simple enough at the time but complications appear to be developing. We need a more detailed understanding of the conditions under which we will refuse to reallocate. Ordinarily we think only of the conflict between growers and processors, but the interests of the individual grower sometimes conflict with the interests of growers as a group. The individual grower may oppose the reallocation of his unused acreage. Yet, if the State as a whole does not produce its full acreage permitted it may lose history.

To be specific, we need guidance as to what to do in the Imperial Valley. It is possible that a large acreage there will not be contracted for in 1959. Under the personal history system in effect in California, Imperial Valley growers would be free to take their proportionate shares elsewhere in the State where they could rent land and get a beet contract. If we are to reallocate any unused acreage to the rest of the State, we need to know about the unused acreage at an early date. What is the earliest date the Imperial Valley could supply us with such information?

Our entire allocation and reallocation procedure needs to be examined and perhaps revised to make it effective in meeting the Imperial Valley situation. The closed plant will leave a large acreage out of cultivation. Additional acreage may be involved in contract disputes. Strong measures may be necessary to prevent a chaotic situation from developing. The prospect of a large number of farmers milling around in vain for acreage contracts is not a pleasant one.

As a possible approach, a survey might be made of the number of farmers who will transfer their beet growing operations from the Imperial Valley to the other district in California. Another possible procedure would be to have all proportionate shares in the Imperial Valley scaled down so that the remaining proportionate shares would approximate the volume that the remaining factories wish to contract for. The problem appears to be too large to be solved by differentiating among growers who have history with the closed plant, growers who have history with the open plants, and growers who have contract disputes. Again, the Department will do all in its power to be helpful but we must depend upon growers and processors to decide upon the solution they want and the procedure that will be effective.

The problem of what to do with proportionate share acreage that is unused as the result of the closing of plants, needs reexamination from the standpoint of the industry as a whole. So far our position has been that the acreage goes first to other growers within the producing district of the State and then to the State. It has been our position always that proportionate shares belong to growers, just as marketing allotments belong to processors. It might be well to consider, however, whether processors should be given any rights in the transfer of such acreage. This may be an unfortunate time to raise such a question in California but I think the matter deserves consideration. I know of the disappointment that affected growers may have over the loss of

a plant. Nevertheless, the industry, for the country as a whole, is not benefitted by the continued operation of submarginal plants that can be kept open only through ever increasing contributions from growers or consumers.

Finally, your industry needs to reexamine the matter of whether the unused acreage resulting from closed plants properly belongs to the producing district or State where the plant operated or whether it should be reallocated throughout the country. I am well aware of the answer your aggressive Executive Manager will give. The fact remains that new producers in other States may consider that they have as much right to such unused acreage as do new producers in California.

These comments are not intended to be comprehensive and certainly they do not contain answers to questions. They are made solely to stimulate thought on the problems ahead. On two points, however, I want to be positive, even to the point of being dogmatic. (1) The domestic sugar situation has changed fundamentally from what it was in the early post-war period. (2) The acreage control programs that worked so successfully and satisfactorily in the past cannot be counted upon to work equally well in the future. Growers and processors, as well as the government, need to recognize that the battle for acreage is a fight that has just begun.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONSDate announcedAdministrative action

January 31,
1959

Revision in paragraph 801.4(b) of Sugar Regulations 801 referred to in January 1959 Sugar Reports became effective January 31, 1959. This revision relates to proceedings for allotting sugar quotas. (See January 31, 1959 Federal Register).

February 6,
1959

Public hearing announced on allotment to processors of the 1959 sugar quota for the Mainland Cane Sugar Area. The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. (CST), March 10, 1959 in the Auditorium of the International House, New Orleans, La. (See February 11, 1959 Federal Register).

February 6,
1959

Determination of minimum wage rates for Virgin Islands sugarcane field workers during calendar year 1959, such rates to be the same as those in effect during 1958. (See February 11, 1959 Federal Register).

STATISTICAL SERIES IN THIS ISSUE1. Revised format for tabulations

The Sugar supply and disposition of primary distributors are brought into focus more clearly than heretofore with new format used in this issue of SUGAR REPORTS for calendar year 1958 data (table 1). Data for the 4 types of primary distributors, previously scattered in 4 tables, are brought together in one tabulation without sacrificing details heretofore shown. Only strictly comparable data for two or more types of primary distributors are shown on the same line in table 1. Related data are shown on separate lines. This should clarify the similarities and distinctions among the data that grow out of the differences in functions of the several types of primary distributors. The tables on mainland sugar production and quota ("allotment") charges, and on refiners' and importers' receipts by sources of supply have been expanded to show current and previous year comparisons.

2. Highlights

a. January sugar deliveries for U.S. consumption, 559,000 short tons, raw value (preliminary) down 13,000 tons, or 2.2 percent from January 1958. Final data for December 1958 deliveries 842,000 tons, and for calendar year 1958 deliveries 9,034,000 tons; previously published preliminary data were 822,000 tons, and 9,015,000 tons, respectively.

b. Primary distributors' stocks January 31, 1959 were 1,889,000 short tons, raw value (preliminary) up 16,000 tons from end December but down 62,000 from a year earlier. During January beet processors' stocks increased 53,000 and refiners' stocks decreased 37,000 tons; stocks of importers of direct-consumption sugar and of mainland sugarcane processors changed very little. Refiners' stocks on January 31, 1959 were 64,000 tons larger than a year earlier but beet processors' stocks were 65,000 tons smaller, mainland sugarcane processors' stocks 50,000 smaller and importers of direct-consumption sugar stocks 11,000 tons smaller.

c. Quota charges during January were 713,000 tons, 8.2 percent larger than January 1958. Charges to quotas up: Hawaii 60,000 tons, "full duty" foreign countries 40,000 tons, Philippines 35,000 tons, Domestic Beet Area 12,000 tons. Charges to quotas down: Mainland Cane Area 59,000 tons, Cuba 30,000 tons, and Puerto Rico about 3,000 tons.

d. December 1958 sugar deliveries were larger by 4 to 5 percent than December 1957 to Middle Atlantic and North Central regions and by 21 percent to the Southern region; to the New England and Western regions deliveries were about 2 percent smaller. As compared with the preceding month December 1958 deliveries ranged from 10 to 62 percent larger. During calendar year 1958 sugar deliveries ranged between 2 and 7 percent larger than during 1957 to the New England, North Central, and Southern regions; deliveries to Middle Atlantic and Western regions changed less than 1 percent.

Table 1. -Sugar supply and disposition by primary distributors, calendar year 1958

Short tons, raw value

Item	Beet 1/ processors	1/ Importers	Mainland 2/ cane processors	Refiners		Net total
				Raw	Refined	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
			SUPPLY			
<u>Inventory Jan.1,1958</u>						
1. 1957 quota	0	12,998	0	214,486	223,704	451,188
2. 1958 quota or exempt	1,234,327	4,934	81,249	66,789 ^{3/}	41,326 ^{3/}	1,428,625
3. Sub-total	1,234,327	17,932	81,249	281,275	265,030	1,879,813
<u>Production and Movement</u>						
4. Received as direct-consumption sugar	---	627,378	---	---	11,981	639,359
5. Produced from beets or cane	2,241,658	---	453,482	---	74,005)	---
Less deliveries to refiners	---	---	469,207	---	---	2,299,938 ^{4/}
6. Receipts of raws by refiners	---	---	---	6,228,221 ^{5/}	---	---
Less raw melted	---	---	---	6,167,149	---	61,072 ^{6/}
7. Refined from raws melted	---	---	---	---	6,129,679	6,129,679
8. Adjustments	-589	-195	+93	-3,233	-7,032	-10,956
9. Sub-total	2,241,069	627,183	-15,632	57,839	6,208,633	9,119,092
10. Net supply	3,475,396	645,115	65,617 ^{4/}	339,114	6,473,663	10,998,905
<u>DISPOSITION</u>						
<u>Distribution for</u>						
11. Quota purposes	2,241,141	580,906	49,950	4,214	6,157,520	9,033,731
12. Export	1,905	6,340	0	0	51,477	59,722
13. Livestock feed and other quota exempt	488	29,340	9	0	2,735	32,572
14. Sub-total	2,243,534	616,586	49,959	4,214	6,211,732	9,126,025
<u>Inventory Dec. 31,1958</u>						
16. 1958 quota	0	17,330	0	214,136	225,483	456,949
17. 1959 quota or exempt	1,231,862	11,199	15,658	120,764 ^{7/}	36,448 ^{7/}	1,415,931
18. Sub-total	1,231,862	28,529	15,658	334,900	261,931	1,872,880
19. Total distribution and stocks	3,475,396	645,115	65,617	339,114	6,473,663	10,998,905

1/ Direct-consumption sugar only.

2/ Processor-refiners are included with refiners.

3/ Of which Mainland cane sugar: raws -- processor-refiners, 12,747 tons, other refiners, 32,411 tons, total, 45,158 tons; refined -- processor-refiners, 28,078 tons, other refiners, 4,299 tons, total, 32,377 tons.

4/ Production less deliveries of raw sugar to refiners.

5/ Includes the 469,207 tons delivered from mainland cane processors.

6/ Difference between receipts and melt.

7/ Of which Mainland cane sugar: raws -- processor-refiners, 10,714 tons, other refiners, 0 tons, total, 10,714 tons; refined -- processor-refiners, 23,225 tons, other refiners 0 tons, total, 23,225 tons.

Table 2.-Distribution of sugar by primary distributors in the continental United States, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii during January-December 1958 and 1957

Item	1958	1957	Change 1957: to 1958
------	------	------	-------------------------

(Short tons, raw value)

Continental United States

Refiners' raw	4,214	3,708	+ 506
Refiners' refined	6,211,732	6,053,154	+158,578
Beet processors' refined	2,243,534	2,067,232	+176,302
Importers' direct consumption	616,586	585,463	+ 31,123
Mainland sugarcane processors' direct-consumption	49,959	61,220	- 11,261
Total	9,126,025	8,770,777	+355,248
Deliveries for:			
Export	59,722	29,904	+ 29,818
Livestock feed	32,572	6,885	+ 25,687
Continental consumption ^{1/}	9,033,731	8,733,988	+299,743
<u>Puerto Rico</u>	109,549	107,756	+ 1,793
<u>Hawaii</u>	38,931	40,428	- 1,497

^{1/} Includes deliveries for United States Military forces at home and abroad.

Table 3.-Mainland sugar: Production and quota charges January-December 1958 and 1957

Item	1958	1957	Change 1957: to 1958
------	------	------	-------------------------

(Short tons, raw value)

Production

Mainland cane	573,448	535,377	+ 38,071
Domestic beet	2,241,069	2,024,532	+216,537
Total	2,814,517	2,559,909	+254,608

Quota charges

Mainland cane:

Louisiana sugarcane processors

For further processing	348,714	312,544	+ 36,170
For direct-consumption	42,500	52,321	- 9,821

Louisiana processor-refiners	126,353	120,186	+ 6,167
------------------------------	---------	---------	---------

Florida sugarcane processors	162,759	150,634	+ 12,125
------------------------------	---------	---------	----------

Sub-total	680,326	635,685	+ 44,641
-----------	---------	---------	----------

Beet processors	2,241,105	2,065,687	+175,418
-----------------	-----------	-----------	----------

Total	2,921,431	2,701,372	+220,059
--------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------

Table 4. -Sugar receipts of refiners and importers by source of supply^{1/}

Source of supply	Raw sugar		Direct-consumption sugar	
	1958	1957	1958	1957
(Short tons, raw value)				
<u>Offshore</u>				
<u>Foreign</u>			^{2/}	^{2/}
Cuba	3,205,100	2,768,088	412,594	377,778
Philippines	966,770	874,926	23,322	24,492
Other countries	216,566	173,092	64,505	58,806
Sub-total	4,388,436	3,816,106	500,421	461,076
<u>Domestic</u>			^{2/}	^{2/}
Hawaii	618,524	1,002,834	11,660	30,002
Puerto Rico	695,781	769,167	127,278	130,736
Virgin Islands	6,093	14,753	0	0
Sub-total	1,320,398	1,786,754	138,938	160,738
Total offshore	5,708,834	5,602,860	639,359	621,814
Mainland cane area	517,199 ^{3/}	460,246	0	0
Acquired for reprocessing	2,188	3,010	0	0
Grand total	6,228,221	6,066,116	639,359	621,814

^{1/} Includes sugar received in 1958 and 1957 which was quota exempt or not chargeable to respective year quotas as follows:

Purpose	Importers		Refiners		Total	
	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957

(Short tons, raw value)

Feed	28,547	4,603	2,314	227	30,861	4,830
Re-export	10,170	1,882	41,847	14,457	52,017	16,339
Refining under bond	0	0	119,197	10,169	119,197	10,169
In Customs custody	8,719	4,934	0	11,462	8,719	16,396
Total	47,436	11,419	163,358	36,315	210,794	47,734

^{2/} Includes refined sugar received by refiners as follows: from Cuba, 321 tons in 1958 and none in 1957; from Hawaii, 11,660 tons in 1958 and 30,002 tons in 1957.

^{3/} Includes 46,157 tons of raw sugar in 1958 and 40,808 tons in 1957 produced at raw mills of processor-refiners and not included in deliveries for further processing shown in Table 3.

Table 5. -Distribution of sugar by primary distributors in the continental United States, January 1959 and 1958

Item	: : 1959 ^{1/} :	: : 1958 :
	(Short tons, raw value)	
Refiners	426,373	459,246
Beet processors	100,246	88,052
Importers	30,486	31,119
Mainland sugarcane processors	<u>2,000^{2/}</u>	<u>2,870</u>
Total	559,105	581,287
Deliveries for:		
Export	<u>3/</u>	8,450
Livestock feed	<u>3/</u>	1,137
For continental consumption <u>4/</u>	559,105	571,700

1/ Preliminary

2/ Estimated

3/ Not available

4/ Includes deliveries for U. S. military forces at home and abroad

Table 6. -Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, January 31, 1959 and 1958

Primary distributors	: : 1959 ^{1/} :	: : 1958 :
	(Short tons, raw value)	
Refiners:		
Raw	283,447	218,527
Refined	<u>276,548</u>	<u>277,593</u>
Sub-total	559,995	496,120
Beet processors	1,285,133	1,350,623
Importers, direct-consumption	28,103	39,161
Mainland sugarcane processors	<u>16,000^{2/}</u>	<u>65,628</u>
Total	1,889,231	1,951,532

1/ Preliminary. 2/ Estimated.

Table 7. -Status of 1959 Sugar Quotas as of January 31, 1959^{1/}

Area	Quota	Credit: for draw- back of duty	Total	Charge to quota & off- ^{2/} set to drawback of duty:		Unfilled balance	
				Direct- consump- tion from: offshore	areas ^{3/}	Within direct con- sumption limits for offshore	areas
Short tons, raw value							
Domestic beet	1,998,717		100,000			1,898,717	
Mainland cane	615,024		20,000			595,024	
Hawaii	1,115,479		71,157	2,237		1,044,322	29,166
Puerto Rico	1,166,375		6,399	6,399		1,159,976	129,714
Virgin Islands	15,905		0			15,905	
Republic of the Philippines	980,000	0	72,362	1,685		907,638	58,235
Cuba	3,060,475	517	361,703	20,658		2,699,289	354,461
Other foreign countries	248,025	632	81,630	15,085		167,027	52,024
Total	9,200,000	1,149	713,251	46,064		8,487,898	623,600
Details of other foreign countries							
Peru	86,867	118	24,636	2,936		62,349	6,891
Dominican Republic	71,557	436	32,285	0		39,708	8,761
Mexico	54,609	78	14,269	2,572		40,418	13,342
Nicaragua	12,879	0	3,003	2,140		9,876	8,354
Haiti	6,597	0	0	0		6,597	6,597
Netherlands	3,592	0	3,591	3,591		1	1
China	3,505	0	762	762		2,743	2,743
Panama	3,505	0	642	642		2,863	2,863
Costa Rica	3,498	0	1,110	1,110		2,388	2,388
Canada	631	0	631	631		0	0
United Kingdom	516	0	516	516		0	0
Belgium	182	0	182	182		0	0
British Guiana	84	0	0	0		84	84
Hong Kong	3	0	3	3		0	0
Total	248,025	632	81,630 ^{5/}	15,085		167,027	52,024

LIQUID SUGAR ^{6/}

(wine gallons of 72 percent total sugar content)

Cuba	7,970,558	0	7,970,558
Dominican Republic	830,894	22,889	808,005
British West Indies	300,000	0	300,000

1/ Quota exempt sugar entered under Section 212(4) as follows: Cuban for export, 1,142; for feed, 5,485; Brazilian for export, 10,941; for feed, 798; Dominican Republic for export, 5,673; Mexican for export, 2,140; for feed, 181; Peruvian for export, 824; totals for export, 20,720; for feed, 6,464; grand total, 27,184.

2/ These data include the following: (a) Domestic beet and mainland cane sugar partly estimated; (b) raw sugar from all areas except "other foreign countries," and direct-consumption sugar from Cuba entered through January 31, 1959 as shown by quota clearance papers received in the Sugar Division through February 11, 1959; and (c) all sugar from "other foreign countries" and direct-consumption sugar from all areas except Cuba entered or certified for entry as of January 31, 1959.

3/ Includes raw sugar for direct-consumption from Cuba, 3,551.

4/ Applications being held pending availability of quota; Hong Kong, 18 tons.

5/ Under Section 212(1), charges to quotas exclude the first 10 tons entered from West Germany and from each country having entries listed above.

6/ Under Section 212(3), 1,087 gallons were entered from the United Kingdom.

Table 8.-Comparison of charges to quotas and offsets to drawback of duty, January 1959 and 1958

(Short tons, raw value and percentages)

Area	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	:	:	:	Increase		Decrease	
	:	:	:	Tons	Percent	Tons	Percent
	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Domestic beet	100,000 ^{1/}	87,853 ^{2/}	12,147	13.8			
Mainland cane	20,000	79,221				59,221	74.8
Hawaii	71,157	11,451	59,706	521.4			
Puerto Rico	6,399	9,176				2,777	30.3
Virgin Islands	0	0					
Philippines	72,362	37,783	34,579	91.5			
Cuba	361,703	391,845				30,142	7.7
Other foreign countries	81,630	41,708	39,922	95.7			
Total	713,251	659,037	54,214	8.2			
Details of other foreign countries							
Peru	24,636	7,486	17,150	229.1			
Dominican Republic	32,285	8,207	24,078	293.4			
Mexico	14,269	19,721				5,452	27.6
Nicaragua	3,003	1,328	1,675	126.1			
Haiti	0	0					
Netherlands	3,591	3,313	278	8.4			
China	762	0	762				
Panama	642	321	321	100.0			
Costa Rica	1,110	0	1,110				
Canada	631	631					
United Kingdom	516	516					
Belgium	182	182					
British Guiana	0	0					
Hong Kong	3	3					
Total	81,630	41,708	39,922	95.7			

LIQUID SUGAR

(Wine gallons of 72 percent total sugar content)

Cuba	0	364,583		364,583
Dominican Republic	22,889	20,168	2,721	13.5
British West Indies	0	0		

^{1/} Partly estimated^{2/} Revised

Table 9. -Status of 1959 Sugar Quotas as of February 11, 1959^{1/}

		</				

LIQUID SUGAR ^{6/}

(wine gallons of 72 percent total sugar content)

Cuba	7,970,558	312,500	7,658,058
Dominican Republic	830,894	22,889	808,005
British West Indies	300,000	0	300,000

1/ Quota exempt sugar entered under Section 212(4) as follows: Cuban for export, 2,281; for feed, 5,485; Brazilian for export, 10,941; for feed, 798; Dominican Republic for export, 5,673; Mexican for export, 2,162; for feed, 343; Peruvian for export, 1,530; totals for export, 22,587; for feed, 6,626; grand total, 29,213.

2/ These data include the following: (a) Domestic beet and mainland cane sugar partly estimated; (b) raw sugar from all areas except "other foreign countries," and direct consumption sugar from Cuba entered through February 11, 1959 as shown by quota clearance papers received in the Sugar Division through February 11, 1959; and (c) all sugar from "other foreign countries" and direct consumption sugar from all areas except Cuba entered or certified for entry as of February 11, 1959.

3/ Includes raw sugar for direct consumption from Cuba, 3,551. 4/ Applications being held pending availability of quota: Hong Kong, 18 tons. 5/ Under Section 212 (1) charges to quotas exclude the first 10 tons entered from West Germany and from each country having entries listed above. 6/ Under Section 212(3), 2,487 gallons were entered from the United Kingdom.

Table 10.-Deliveries of Sugar by Primary Distributors by States, December 1958

State	Cane sugar refiners 1/	Beet sugar processors 1/	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	1/ Total
<u>Hundredweight, refined equivalent</u>					
NEW ENGLAND					
CONN	103877		3934	300	108111
ME	52110		840		52950
MASS	418740		7296	350	426386
N H	25674				25674
R I	44073		3317		47390
VT	21449		2000		23449
TOTAL	665923		17387	650	683960
MID ATLANTIC					
N J	565264		22639	1000	588903
N Y	1335138	63240	45181		1443559
PENN	832029	38751	38649	2	909431
TOTAL	2732431	101991	106469	1002	2941893
N CENTRAL					
ILL	629812	1420589	2058	141171	2193630
IND	239950	136859		240	377049
IOWA	53581	166741	3894		224216
KAN	69927	119913			189840
MICH	226092	369012	1834	900	597838
MINN	47248	245725			292973
MO	278094	163944		3805	445843
NEBR	20674	128340		1202	150216
N DAK	680	32741			33421
OHIO	543988	196928	3077	1800	745793
S DAK	4494	29188			33682
WISC	128578	245445		8000	382023
TOTAL	2243118	3255425	10863	157118	5666524
SOUTHERN					
ALA	265448			20478	285926
ARK	97036	6990			104026
DEL	17289			1	17290
D C	47404		2723		50127
FLA	143236		51507	42069	236812
GA	338903		9817	770	349490
KY	187896	3344		6455	197695
LA	308907		119	26483	335509
MD	277793		15999		293792
MISS	186006			3151	189157
N C	259361		24600		283961
OKLA	106527	34983			141510
S C	128928		9257		138185
TENN	313152		1020	18800	332972
TEXAS	435297	173454	6300	68122	683173
VA	158489		42630	2	201121
W VA	66814	5150	2652		74616
TOTAL	3338486	223921	166624	186331	3915362
WESTERN					
ARIZ	25677	17707			43384
CALI	462305	1277194	3600	1200	1744299
COLO	8346	47227		652	56225
IDAHO	4066	20193			24259
MONT	2941	33735			36676
NEV	3533	3418			6951
N MEX	12954	19948			32902
ORE	54004	60526			114530
UTAH	4768	45261			50029
WASH	63472	124083	2755		190310
WYO	522	10064			10586
TOTAL	642588	1659356	6355	1852	2310151
GRAND TOTAL	9622546	5240693	307698	346953	15517890

1/ Excludes that portion of the constructive deliveries for which state destination data are not yet available, as follows: beet processors, 285,886 hundredweight; and cane sugar refiners, 120,294 hundredweight.

Table 11.--Deliveries of Sugar by Primary Distributors by States, Fourth quarter 1958

State	Cane sugar refiners 1/	Beet sugar processors 1/	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	1/ Total
Hundredweight, refined equivalent					
NEW ENGLAND					
CONN	312556		7204	900	320660
ME	152593		2468		155061
MASS	1272555		26232	850	1299637
N H	75900				75900
R I	125610		7042		132652
VT	67955		3060		71015
TOTAL	2007169		46006	1750	2054925
MID ATLANTIC					
N J	1757408		83005	2000	1842413
N Y	4018815	146703	169226		4334744
PENN	2481243	80059	252111	9	2813422
TOTAL	8257466	226762	504342	2009	8990579
N CENTRAL					
ILL	1727058	3035947	16588	193589	4973182
IND	660799	291474	4409	2849	959531
IOWA	140108	380868	9834	600	531410
KAN	188864	243297			432161
MICH	661914	893421	6401	1900	1563636
MINN	111347	549684			661031
MO	694177	356733		6555	1057465
NEBR	72076	300062		1809	373947
N DAK	2097	86923			89020
OHIO	1642361	491942	15986	1900	2152189
S DAK	8288	82473			90761
WISC	337765	526405		11000	875170
TOTAL	6246854	7239229	53218	220202	13759503
SOUTHERN					
ALA	679233			21524	700757
ARK	270924	9990			280914
DEL	47901			1	47902
D C	127216		15613		142829
FLA	382730		276881	58374	717985
GA	916739		61058	770	978567
KY	519553	9832		8400	537785
LA	924197		5683	40485	970365
MD	808488		51326		859814
MISS	505581			6056	511637
N C	742506		141539		884045
OKLA	281837	82778	225	25	364865
S C	386267		33567		419834
TENN	829942		1993	23820	855755
TEXAS	1376948	370397	18307	78476	1844128
VA	530917		156687	228	687832
W VA	243284	7100	9893		260277
TOTAL	9574263	480097	772772	238159	11065291
WESTERN					
ARIZ	72029	55792			127821
CALI	1467292	2519010	25171	2010	4013483
COLO	27306	189481		656	217443
IDAHO	11224	55076			66300
MONT	7795	80232			88027
NEV	13936	9827			23763
N MEX	36509	53868			90377
ORE	141577	168185	2400		312162
UTAH	15932	112211		20	128163
WASH	165875	360369	12889		539133
WYO	1836	24699			26535
TOTAL	1961311	3628750	40460	2686	5633207
GRAND TOTAL	28047063	11574838	1416798	464806	41503505

1/ Excludes that portion of the constructive deliveries for which state destination data are not yet available, as follows: beet processors, 285,886 hundredweight; and cane sugar refiners, 120,294 hundredweight.

Table 12.-Deliveries of Sugar by Primary Distributors by States, calendar year 1958

State	Cane sugar refiners 1/	Beet sugar processors 1/	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	1/ Total
Hundredweight, refined equivalent					
NEW ENGLAND					
CONN	1210723		58224	1440	1270387
ME	670156		11148		681304
MASS	4972902		134399	1090	5108391
N H	341793		400		342193
R I	507692		29837		537529
VT	237926		68581		306507
TOTAL	7941192		302589	2530	8246311
MID ATLANTIC					
N J	7171759		642483	2000	7816242
N Y	15464318	341828	1234836		17040982
PENN	9838453	175376	2517416	189	12531424
TOTAL	32474530	517204	4394735	2189	37388658
N. CENTRAL					
ILL	6921982	9138338	105764	398424	16564508
IND	2815198	1185855	30055	3662	4034770
IOWA	638127	1512411	49521	633	2200692
KAN	773579	894448	2522	1183	1671732
MICH	2652298	2877391	244737	31930	5806356
MINN	461338	2066294	8894		2536526
MO	2930218	1272024	4416	10931	4217589
NEBR	361285	1127147	1804	4644	1494880
N DAK	4652	374141			378793
OHIO	6922801	1388851	202744	4237	8518633
S DAK	26044	364950	600		391594
WISC	1392038	1838899	8969	48180	3288086
TOTAL	25899560	24040749	660026	503824	51104159
SOUTHERN					
ALA	2919590			30430	2950020
ARK	1167397	44993	800	309	1213499
DEL	196077		14830	4	210911
D C	505230		110653		615883
FLA	1397417		1985924	128099	3511440
GA	4280681		538168	1520	4820369
KY	2332508	23699	70688	37625	2464520
LA	3645479		12960	97859	3756298
MD	3360231		430231	24	3790486
MISS	2275655		12187	6939	2294781
N C	3227215		754397	1	3981613
OKLA	1233498	327244	340	825	1561907
S C	1615258		178248		1793506
TENN	3379148		21130	35061	3425339
TEXAS	6361828	1434203	179953	96860	8072844
VA	2167861	700	818642	238	2987441
W VA	1051588	7450	83079		1142117
TOTAL	41116661	1838289	5212230	435794	48602974
WESTERN					
ARIZ	320331	217362			537693
CALI	6131917	9813315	138823	4460	16088515
COLO	102296	904587		1374	1008257
IDAHO	52206	318830			371036
MONT	22346	352080		1	374427
NEV	61321	40152			101473
N MEX	154791	222711			377502
ORE	639412	999668	85350		1724430
UTAH	72057	598379		20	670456
WASH	727036	1654281	120514		2501831
WYO	7938	114018			121956
TOTAL	8291651	15235383	344687	5855	23877576
GRAND TOTAL	115723594	41631625	10914267	950192	169219678

1/ Excludes that portion of the constructive deliveries for which state destination data are not yet available, as follows: beet processors, 285,886 hundredweight; and cane sugar refiners, 120,294 hundredweight.

Table 13.-Deliveries of sugar by primary distributors, by States, calendar years 1957 and 1958

Thousands hundredweights, refined equivalent

	Beet processors		Cane sugar refiners		Importers of D.C.sugar		Mainland cane sugar mills		Total	
	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958	1957	1958
New England										
Connecticut			1,149	1,211	56	58	1	1	1,206	1,270
Maine			675	670	4	11			679	681
Massachusetts			4,896	4,973	134	135	1	1	5,031	5,109
New Hampshire			337	342	1	*			338	342
Rhode Island			523	508	15	30			538	538
Vermont			230	237	75	69			305	306
Total			7,810	7,941	285	303	2	2	8,097	8,246
Mid-Atlantic										
New Jersey			7,056	7,172	588	642	1	2	7,645	7,816
New York	184	342	15,770	15,464	1,528	1,235			17,482	17,041
Pennsylvania	36	175	9,881	9,839	2,419	2,518	*	*	12,336	12,532
Total	220	517	32,707	32,475	4,535	4,395	1	2	37,463	37,389
North Central										
Illinois	8,951	9,139	6,829	6,922	53	106	449	398	16,282	16,565
Indiana	937	1,186	2,833	2,815	27	30	15	4	3,812	4,035
Iowa	1,410	1,513	690	638	4	49	5	1	2,109	2,201
Kansas	878	895	741	774		2	4	1	1,623	1,672
Michigan	2,671	2,877	2,579	2,652	238	245	108	32	5,596	5,806
Minnesota	1,968	2,066	434	461	2	9	1		2,405	2,536
Missouri	1,226	1,272	2,621	2,931	1	4	7	11	3,855	4,218
Nebraska	1,164	1,127	393	361		2	4	5	1,561	1,495
North Dakota	353	374	9	5	1				363	379
Ohio	859	1,389	6,756	6,923	142	203	4	4	7,761	8,519
South Dakota	371	364	27	25		1			398	390
Wisconsin	1,813	1,839	1,351	1,392	12	9	80	48	3,256	3,288
Total	22,601	24,041	25,263	25,899	480	660	677	504	49,021	51,104
Southern										
Alabama			2,453	2,919			20	31	2,473	2,950
Arkansas	35	45	1,089	1,168		1	*	*	1,124	1,214
Delaware			171	196	5	15		*	176	211
Dist. of Columbia			536	505	68	111			604	616
Florida			1,232	1,397	1,740	1,986	167	128	3,139	3,511
Georgia			4,177	4,280	519	538	5	2	4,701	4,820
Kentucky	8	24	1,979	2,333	61	71	42	37	2,090	2,465
Louisiana			3,475	3,645	30	13	76	98	3,581	3,756
Maryland			3,385	3,360	426	430	9	*	3,820	3,790
Mississippi			2,284	2,276	1	12	15	7	2,300	2,295
North Carolina			2,992	3,228	906	754	*	*	3,898	3,982
Oklahoma	331	327	1,068	1,234		*	1	1	1,400	1,562
South Carolina			1,579	1,616	162	178	*		1,741	1,794
Tennessee			2,952	3,379	14	21	1	35	2,967	3,435
Texas	1,212	1,434	6,065	6,362	255	180	88	97	7,620	8,073
Virginia		1	2,087	2,167	764	819	*	*	2,851	2,987
West Virginia	1	7	977	1,052	66	83			1,044	1,142
Total	1,587	1,838	38,501	41,117	5,017	5,212	424	436	45,529	48,603
Western										
Arizona	217	217	302	321			1		520	538
California	8,811	9,813	7,129	6,132	179	139	2	5	16,121	16,089
Colorado	932	905	102	102			1	1	1,035	1,008
Idaho	314	319	48	52					362	371
Montana	343	352	21	22				*	364	374
Nevada	28	40	69	61					97	101
New Mexico	193	223	127	155					320	378
Oregon	1,018	1,000	720	640	71	85			1,809	1,725
Utah	644	598	75	72				*	719	670
Washington	1,618	1,655	761	727	97	120			2,476	2,502
Wyoming	117	114	8	8					125	122
Total	14,235	15,236	9,362	8,292	347	344	4	6	23,948	23,878
Grand Total	38,643	41,632	113,643	115,724	10,664	10,914	1,108	950	164,058	169,220

1/ Excludes that portion of the constructive deliveries for which state destination data are not yet available, as follows: beet processors, 285,886 hundredweight; and cane sugar refiners, 120,294 hundredweight.

* Less than 500 hundredweights.

Table 14.-Deliveries of Sugar by Primary Distributors by States, December 1957 (revised)

State	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
<u>Hundredweight, refined equivalent</u>					
NEW ENGLAND					
CONN	96825		4195	270	101290
ME	51986		300		52286
MASS	439220		9625	330	449175
N H	23918				23918
R I	45012		2400		47412
VT	19728		7600		27328
TOTAL	676689		24120	600	701409
MID ATLANTIC					
N J	541139		23371		564510
N Y	1233258	86739	60641		1380638
PENN	804650	15400	77206	13	897269
TOTAL	2579047	102139	161218	13	2842417
N CENTRAL					
ILL	591931	1456371		111220	2159522
IND	201902	105729		2600	310231
IOWA	54736	165055			219791
KAN	59279	121833			181112
MICH	208398	390380	1087	60025	659890
MINN	37560	196230	325	1	234116
MO	191759	176216		1971	369946
NEBR	21752	126475		601	148828
N DAK	817	32960			33777
OHIO	526096	141273	1546	100	669015
S DAK	2265	35721			37986
WISC	121640	250533		14202	386375
TOTAL	2018135	3198776	2958	190720	5410589
SOUTHERN					
ALA	193357			3360	196717
ARK	75386	5000		302	80688
DEL	13534				13534
D C	41700		4950		46650
FLA	108552		70390	40711	219653
GA	305105		9239	2850	317194
KY	143996	2166		7845	154007
LA	258719			6355	265074
MD	259589		13431	8723	281743
MISS	158485			1810	160295
N C	226627		30331		256958
OKLA	78019	40572			118591
S C	122231		8546		130777
TENN	201777		340	1200	203317
TEXAS	377389	129591	2045	38663	547688
VA	145595		35567	4	181166
W VA	66051	700	3093		69844
TOTAL	2776112	178029	177932	111823	3243896
WESTERN					
ARIZ	27121	19896			47017
CALI	515537	1196743	11956		1724236
COLO	9474	127944			137418
IDAHO	4229	17534			21763
MONT	2148	33207			35355
NEV	4695	2069			6764
N MEX	9911	15723			25634
ORE	63224	67115			130339
UTAH	5603	52361			57964
WASH	66726	104024			170750
WYO	852	9662			10514
TOTAL	709520	1646278	11956		2367754
GRAND TOTAL	8759503	5125222	378184	303156	14566065

Table 15.-Deliveries of Sugar by Primary Distributors by States, Fourth quarter, 1957
(revised)

State	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
<u>Hundredweight, refined equivalent</u>					
NEW ENGLAND					
CONN	286330		12400	270	299000
ME	152357		1000		153357
MASS	1282353		32070	330	1314753
N H	73520		200		73720
R I	125169		5650		130819
VT	59079		18600		77679
TOTAL	1978808		69920	600	2049328
MID ATLANTIC					
N J	1709832		120602	1100	1831534
N Y	3983246	155262	290398		4428906
PENN	2424830	24954	439911	42	2889737
TOTAL	8117908	180216	850911	1142	9150177
N CENTRAL					
ILL	1597943	3003709	350	200441	4802443
IND	605023	283641	3303	6803	898770
IOWA	150401	341505	602	5	492513
KAN	171388	236062		4	407454
MICH	615220	780614	3199	101025	1500058
MINN	110193	443924	650	1	554768
MO	597495	348585	602	2251	948933
NEBR	77761	288976		1201	367938
N DAK	1796	80633			82429
OHIO	1599566	281597	10707	900	1892770
S DAK	8507	82932			91439
WISC	326175	496097	149	19532	841953
TOTAL	5861468	6668275	19562	332163	12881468
SOUTHERN					
ALA	559748			5193	564941
ARK	237815	11000		307	249122
DEL	40272		1327		41599
D C	124573		18413		142986
FLA	303747		247713	79304	630764
GA	885651		54183	3600	943434
KY	443613	4491		15983	464087
LA	829054		27700	15288	872042
MD	813476		59326	8723	881525
MISS	472590		540	4737	477867
N C	692922		128104		821026
OKLA	238267	85922		200	324389
S C	364857		37790		402647
TENN	673043		3470	1200	677713
TEXAS	1307535	332583	10717	39284	1690119
VA	513337		140946	21	654304
W VA	221129	700	10671		232500
TOTAL	8721629	434696	740900	173840	10071065
WESTERN					
ARIZ	71652	48947			120599
CALI	1522330	2259161	38573	450	3820514
COLO	26452	235601		702	262755
IDAHO	11333	55152			66485
MONT	6114	77178			83292
NEV	17020	5659			22679
N MEX	30071	42609			72680
ORE	152773	164696	8600		326069
UTAH	16975	136466			153441
WASH	167287	302583	6900		476770
WYO	2098	25774			27872
TOTAL	2024105	3353826	54073	1152	5433156
GRAND TOTAL	26703918	10637013	1735366	508897	39585194

Table 16.-Deliveries of Sugar by Primary Distributors by States, calendar year 1957
(revised)

State	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
<u>Hundredweight, refined equivalent</u>					
NEW ENGLAND					
CONN	1149820		55665	1070	1206555
ME	674818		3740		678558
MASS	4896172		133653	730	5030555
N H	337008		1200		338208
R I	522610		14972		537582
VT	229960		75602		305562
TOTAL	7810388		284832	1800	8097020
MID ATLANTIC					
N J	7056472		587740	1100	7645312
N Y	15769694	184244	1527993		17481931
PENN	9880794	35554	2419232	167	12335747
TOTAL	32706960	219798	4534965	1267	37462990
N CENTRAL					
ILL	6828173	8950880	53590	449081	16281724
IND	2831773	936932	27336	15609	3811650
IOWA	690131	1410413	3797	4672	2109013
KAN	740592	878456		3806	1622854
MICH	2579225	2670840	237710	108168	5595943
MINN	434609	1967936	1670	901	2405116
MO	2621202	1226309	602	6908	3855021
NEBR	393341	1163750		3851	1560942
N DAK	8649	352555	1635		362839
OHIO	6756172	859220	141970	4130	7761492
S DAK	27668	370498			398166
WISC	1350914	1813379	12211	79922	3256426
TOTAL	25262449	22601168	480521	677048	49021186
SOUTHERN					
ALA	2453262			20250	2473512
ARK	1088147	35300		315	1123762
DEL	171487		5045		176532
D C	535734		68005		603739
FLA	1231918		1740343	166740	3139001
GA	4176533		519121	4900	4700554
KY	1978942	7966	60862	42091	2089861
LA	3476060		29863	75513	3581436
MD	3384587		426308	8723	3819618
MISS	2284226		540	14882	2299648
N C	2992269		906147	1	3898417
OKLA	1068818	330526		800	1400144
S C	1578671		162228	200	1741099
TENN	2952281		13405	1207	2966893
TEXAS	6065335	1212020	254624	88477	7620456
VA	2086488		764049	38	2850575
W VA	976540	700	66430		1043670
TOTAL	38501298	1586512	5016970	424137	45528917
WESTERN					
ARIZ	301598	217564		1000	520162
CALI	7128395	8810944	179022	2253	16120614
COLO	101958	932575		704	1035237
IDAHO	48152	313991			362143
MONT	21193	342807			364000
NEV	68832	28185			97017
N MEX	127144	192778			319922
ORE	720250	1018217	70831		1809298
UTAH	75207	643271			718478
WASH	761134	1617738	96497		2475369
WYO	7871	117326			125197
TOTAL	9361734	14235396	346350	3957	23947437
GRAND TOTAL	113642829	38642874	10663638	1108209	164057550

Table 17. -Sugar Prices

Period	Raw cane		Refined cane, quoted wholesale (gross)			
	N.Y. duty	World	New	Gulf	Chicago-	Pacific
	paid	fas, Cuba	York	West	Coast	Coast
	Cents per pound					
1954-58 monthly av.	6.13	3.73	8.90	8.73	8.67	8.82
1957 monthly av.	6.24	5.16	9.15	8.95	8.82	9.12
1958 monthly av.	6.27	3.50	9.27	9.08	8.89	9.21
1958						
February	6.15	3.55	9.15	8.95	8.70	9.10
March	6.03	3.42	9.15	8.95	8.78	9.10
April	6.21	3.45	9.15	8.95	8.85	9.10
May	6.29	3.47	9.24	9.13	9.03	9.28
June	6.27	3.42	9.35	9.15	9.05	9.30
July	6.28	3.50	9.35	9.15	9.05	9.30
August	6.28	3.46	9.35	9.15	9.05	9.30
September	6.37	3.48	9.35	9.15	8.85	9.30
October	6.47	3.41	9.35	9.15	8.85	9.20
November	6.35	3.42	9.35	9.15	8.85	9.20
December	6.44	3.64	9.35	9.15	8.91	9.20
1959						
January	6.15	3.27	9.35	9.25	9.05	9.20
12-month av.	6.27	3.46	9.29	9.11	8.92	9.22

Period	Prices (continued)			
	Refined beet, quoted wholesale (gross 1/)		Refined retail	
	Eastern	Chicago- West	Pacific Coast	U. S. average
	Cents per pound			
1954-58 monthly av.	8.53	8.46	8.73	10.76
1957 monthly av.	8.63	8.62	9.02	11.03
1958 monthly av.	8.61	8.68	9.13	11.26
1958				
February	8.50	8.50	9.00	11.12
March	8.50	8.58	9.00	11.10
April	8.65	8.65	9.00	11.14
May	8.65	8.83	9.18	11.16
June	8.65	8.85	9.20	11.30
July	8.65	8.85	9.20	11.34
August	8.65	8.85	9.20	11.38
September	8.65	8.65	9.20	11.38
October	8.65	8.65	9.20	11.38
November	8.65	8.65	9.20	11.38
December	8.65	8.65	9.20	11.38
1959				
January	8.79	8.79	9.20	
12-month av.	8.64	8.71	9.15	11.28 ^{2/}

1/ Quoted wholesale refined prices represent the current quotations of cane refiners and beet processors in 100 pound paper bags even though orders sometimes are taken on a day to day basis at a lower price and allowances in specific areas are being made. (See Sugar Reports No. 55, page 4). 2/ 11-month average.

Table 18.-Refined sugar production and month-end stocks

Period	Production		Month-end stocks	
	Cane sugar	Beet	Cane sugar	Beet
	refiners	processors	refiners	processors
	1,000 short tons, raw value			
1954-58 monthly av.	507	168	269 1/	824
1957 monthly av.	504	169	296 1/	800
1958 monthly av.	517	187	267 1/	835
1958				
February	429	31	257	1,244
March	457	5	268	1,065
April	516	31	276	960
May	508	73	277	856
June	539	54	270	704
July	597	31	278	508
August	587	16	272	282
September	567	104	245	174
October	556	601	247	583
November	467	630	273	1,066
December	505	460	262	1,232
1959				
January 2/	445	153	277	1,285
12-month av.	514	182	267	830

1/ Over-quota stocks at the end of the year included.

2/ Preliminary.

CATEGORIES, AND NAMES AND PRINCIPAL
LOCATIONS OF PRIMARY DISTRIBUTORS

Beginning with 1956, certain minor revisions were made in the classification of data furnished by primary distributors of direct consumption sugar with respect to receipts, deliveries and stocks.

The four categories of primary distributors used and the names and principal locations of firms in each category revised to December 31, 1958 follow:

Categories of Primary distributors

Refiners	Those who distribute direct consumption sugar, all or any part of which they customarily refine from purchased raw sugar.
Beet processors	Those who distribute direct consumption sugar which they customarily process from sugar beets.
Importers	Those who distribute imported direct consumption sugar and who do not customarily process nor refine sugar.
Mainland sugarcane processors	Those who distribute direct consumption sugar processed by them from sugarcane but who do not customarily purchase raw sugar for refining.

Names and principal location of primary distributors

CONTINENTAL REFINERS

American Molasses Co. <u>1</u> / New York, N. Y.	California & Hawaiian Sugar <u>1</u> / Refining Corp. San Francisco, California
American Sugar Refining Co. New York, N. Y.	Colonial Sugars Co. New Orleans, Louisiana
J. Aron & Co., Inc. <u>2</u> / New Orleans, Louisiana	Henderson Sugar Ref. Inc. New Orleans, Louisiana

CONTINENTAL REFINERS, Cont'd

Imperial Sugar Company <u>1/</u> Sugar Land, Texas	Refined Syrups & Sugars, Inc. Yonkers, New York
Industrial Sugars, Inc. St. Louis, Missouri	Revere Sugar Refinery <u>1/</u> Charlestown, Massachusetts
Krim-Ko Corp. Chicago, Illinois	Savannah Sugar Refining Corp. Savannah, Georgia
Liquid Sugars, Inc. <u>1/</u> Indianapolis Indiana	South Coast Corp. <u>2/</u> New Orleans, Louisiana
National Sugar Refining Co. New York, N. Y.	Southdown Sugars, Inc. <u>2/</u> New Orleans, Louisiana
Pepsi-Cola Company New York, N. Y.	

1/ Also import some sugar within direct-consumption limitations.

2/ Mainland sugarcane processor - refiners who also produce raw sugar.

Note: Published data for refiners includes mainland cane sugar produced and direct-consumption sugar imported by refiners.

BEET PROCESSORS

The Amalgamated Sugar Co. Ogden, Utah	Holly Sugar Corporation Colorado Springs, Colorado
American Crystal Sugar Co. Denver, Colorado	Layton Sugar Company Layton, Utah
Buckeye Sugars, Inc. Ottawa, Ohio	Menominee Sugar Co. Green Bay, Wisconsin
Franklin County Sugar Co. Preston, Idaho	Michigan Sugar Co. Saginaw, Michigan
The Great Western Sugar Company Denver, Colorado	Monitor Sugar Division of Robert Gage Coal Co. Bay City, Michigan

BEET PROCESSORS, Cont'd

The National Sugar
Manufacturing Co.
Sugar City, Colorado

Union Sugar Division
Consolidated Foods Corp.
San Francisco, California

Northern Ohio Sugar Company
Denver, Colorado

Utah-Idaho Sugar Company
Salt Lake City, Utah

Spreckels Sugar Company
San Francisco, California

IMPORTERS

Coca-Cola Company
Atlanta, Georgia

Christman & Company
New York, New York

California Far East, Inc.
San Francisco, California

Lombard & Company
New York, New York

Cuban Canadian Sugar Co. 3/
New York, New York

Lowry & Company, Inc.
New York, New York

Dyer Sugar Associates
New York, New York

Marianao Sugar Trading Corp.
New York, New York

Farr & Company
New York, New York

Minford & Company
New York, New York

Lamborn & Co., Inc.
New York, New York

Monitz Wallack & Colodney
New York, New York

M. Golodetz & Co.
New York, New York

Olavarria & Co., Inc.
New York, New York

W. R. Grace & Co.
New York, New York

H. H. Pike & Co., Inc. 3/
New York, New York

Hershey Sugar Sales Corp.
New York, New York

Woodward & Dickerson, Inc. 3/
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

3/ Sugar for livestock feed exclusively.

MAINLAND SUGARCANE PROCESSORS 4/

Albania Sugar Coop., Inc. Jeanerette, Louisiana	Caire & Graugnard Edgard, Louisiana
Cora-Texas Mfg. Co., Inc. White Castle, Louisiana	Columbia Sugar Company Franklin, Louisiana
Duhe & Bourgeois Sugar Co., Inc. Jeanerette, Louisiana	Meeker Sugar Corp., Inc. Meeker, Louisiana
Evangeline Pepper & Food Prod. Inc. St. Martinville, Louisiana	J. Supple's Sons Planting Co. Ltd. Bayou Goula, Louisiana
Fellsmere Sugar Producers Assoc. Fellsmere, Florida	United States Sugar Corp. Clewiston, Florida
Frisco Cane Co., Inc. Lions, Louisiana	Valentine Sugars, Inc. Lockport, Louisiana
Louisiana State Penitentiary Angola, Louisiana	

4/ Does not include processor-refiners.

Note: Mainland sugarcane processors who distributed direct-consumption sugar in 1958, and still operating in January 1959.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Commodity Stabilization Service
Sugar Division
Washington 25, D. C.
- - - - -

Penalty for Private Use to Avoid
Payments of Postage \$300

FIRST CLASS

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
Permit No. 1001